

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/509,491 | 09/29/2004 | Shinya Hasegawa | 43888-339 | 5359 | |
| 20277 7590 10/12/2007 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP | | | EXAMINER | | |
| 600 13TH STR | EET, N.W. | | GROUP, | GROUP, KARL E | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 1793 | | |
| | | , | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 10/12/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/509,491 | HASEGAWA ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Karl E. Group | 1755 | | | | |
| Period fe | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| WHI0 - Exte after - If NO - Failt Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAMPISIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirn will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE. | I. sely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. 8, 133) | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)[🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ju</u> | ılv 2007 | | | | | |
| | | action is non-final | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| , | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | | | | |
| | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-13 and 15-25</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| . '/ല | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5)□ | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| | 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,4-13 and 15-23</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) <u>24 and 25</u> is/are objected to. | | • | | | | |
| | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement | | | | | |
| · | ion Papers | diction requirement. | | | | | |
| | · | | | | | | |
| | 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | • | • • | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority (| ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(d) or (f). | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | |
| 2) | | | | | | | |
| | r No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | aton Application | | | | |
| | | 10 to 10 | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' request for a complete office action and the restarting of the statutory period is granted. The statutory period will be restarted as of the mailing of this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 2. Claims 1,4-13,15-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al (6,778,355) further in view of Yamamoto et al (6,503,858), for reasons of record.

Applicants' argument that Hasegawa et al fail to teach an Al_2O_3 to SiO_2 ratio of less than .5 is not persuasive in overcoming the rejection. The examples set forth in table 1 and 2 teach Al_2O_3 to SiO_2 ratios of less than .5.

In reference to claims 7,8,11 and 12 Hasegawa et al teach 0-15 wt% alkaline earth metal oxides.

In reference to claim 9, Yamamoto et al teach .3-2.9 wt% rare earth oxide, column 7, lines 22-23.

In reference to claim 10, Hasegawa et al teach 0-4 wt% alumina.

In reference to claims 13 and 15, the zinc to boron ratio is exemplified in Hasegawa et al in Tables 1,2.

Claim 16,20-23 the references teach the application of sealing for magnetic heads.

Application/Control Number: 10/509,491

Art Unit: 1755

Claims 17,18, and 19 set forth a sealing member for a plasma display member however the intended use is not considered to patentably distinguish the claimed glass member.

The intended use of the claimed composition does not patentably distinguish the composition, per se, since such undisclosed use is inherent in the reference composition. In order to be limiting, the intended use must create a structural difference between the claimed composition and the prior art composition. In the instant case, the intended use does not create a structural difference, thus the intended use is not limiting. Please note that when applicant claims a composition in terms of function and the composition of the prior art appears to be the same

As to the filler required in claims 18 and 19, Yamamoto et al teach it is known to add a low expansion filler such as zircon, eucryptite and silica (quartz) glass, to reduce the thermal expansion of the glass (see column 8, lines 1-4.

- 3. Claims 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest the claimed plasma display panel.
- 4. The rejection of claims 1,5,6 over Usui et al (5,733,828) is withdrawn in because Usui et al fail to include an amount of Al_2O_3 . The rejection of claims 1,2,5,6 over Sasoke et al (6,255,329) is withdrawn because Sasoke et al fail to teach or fairly suggest an Al_2O_3 to SiO_2 ratio of less than .5 in combination with the claimed ranges of constituents.
- 5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1755

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl E. Group whose telephone number is 571-272-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00) First Friday Off. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000

∕Karl É Grou**∕s/** Primary Exar⁄niner Art Unit 1755

Keg 8-10-07